



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NATIONAL MAGAZINE.

THE REPEAL OF THE UNION.

WE confess we are not amongst those who relied on the relief bill, as a settlement of the disturbances and discontents of Ireland. Recollecting how justly, though quaintly, Sir John Davis had, two centuries ago, played upon the name, and called it a LAND OF IRE, we could not resign ourselves to the fond anticipations of others, or suppose that the spirits—whose beloved element was the tempest, and who, like the procelarian birds that sport amidst the stormy seas around Cape Horn, win their pleasure in the whirlwind—could bear to live in peaceful climes and swim o'er halcyon seas. No—you might as well expect Satan to rest happy in the paradise of God;—and, therefore, O'Connell and his subordinate demagogues and priests must have a new motive for exerting their energies, a new foot-ball to kick and agitate—and so the repeal of the legislative union is now the watchword of turmoil, and the countersign of mischief. But let us be cool on this occasion—let us look at the matter dispassionately, if possible—and see whether such a repeal is either practicable or profitable:—and, first, let us consider whether it would be profitable for Ireland; for surely, if it should not prove advantageous, there is little necessity for going into the question of its practicability.

And, considering the usefulness of the measure, the questions first to be asked are, whether the union has hitherto worked well for Ireland—and why it has not worked better? And, secondly, whether the imperial parliament has neglected its duty, and not given a proper measure of attention to Ireland and its interests? We think it can safely be answered, that the union has worked as well for the country as could be expected under hitherto existing circumstances, and that the reason why it did ^{not} operate to a more beneficial extent, arose from causes not at all affected by the union—which circumstances are now with safety removed by means of that very British connection, which is sought to be broken up. We maintain, that the Roman Catholic relief bill never could have been with security passed, without the previous measure of union; and that, unless under its protection, the Protestants of Ireland never could, with a due regard to their properties or their lives, have allowed it to be carried. We apprehend that the reason why Ireland is not so prosperous as she ought to be, arises from a want of investment and occupation of capital, in agriculture, trade, and manufacture. We look at England—and we know that her prosperity arises from centuries of expended capital; and, looking at Scotland, we also see that the surpassing march of her improvement is owing to the security felt in investing capital, and in the assured promise of its prolific return.—Now, we would ask, is the want of capital in Ireland owing to the ex-

istence of the union? Certainly not; but it is owing to the unsettled character of its people—to their atrocious combinations, and to their bloody feuds—to their temper and conduct affording no security to the investment of property amongst them. Ireland labours under the want of a resident landed proprietary: we shall show by and by, that the repeal of the union would not call home the absentees, no more than its enactment made them such. And though absenteeism is an evil, we apprehend that it is not the great evil which it is represented; for Scotland is also affected with the same, and yet is prosperous. We hold it, that one Irish coal-field, worked with all its connected iron-forges and potteries, or one cotton or woollen manufactory, established in a county, would create more capital, call into operation more industry, and promote more comfort among the people, than fifty resident lords or squires. We would ask the advocates of the repeal of the union, would their measure be likely to generate capital in the island itself, or call it in from other countries? We trow not. On the contrary, we do assume, that if this odious and mischievous question was not agitated—if the natural results of the relief bill, and of other measures that have been promoted and are devising—if these were allowed to work their ends—and if the philosophical proximity which steam power has lately occasioned between the two countries were permitted to operate—we say that it could not otherwise be, than that all the natural advantages which Ireland possesses would be called forth, and all her great physical capabilities roused into productiveness.

But it is said that Dublin, the metropolis of Ireland, has suffered, and will continue to suffer, from the influence of the union. Now, without considering the question, how far the interests of the whole island should be sacrificed to promote the local advantages of one town, we can state, from our own recollection, that Dublin has improved to a great extent, indeed, since the union. We appeal to the recollection of every one who knows what this city was before the commencement of the present century—and we hold that she has vastly improved in her external appearance, in the comforts and civilization of her population, and in her general prosperity; and can safely say, that in no town in the empire have so many buildings been commenced and continued in rapid progress, as in Dublin since the passing of the relief bill. Yes, but Dublin had a manufacture, and so had Kilkenny and Carrick-on-Suir; and the linen-trade *was* in the North. True; but what sort of a manufacture?—a sickly, unnatural, abortive thing, bolstered up by the protecting duties, which a dark, jealous, and suicidal policy threw around it—and which could no more be suffered to exist in the present day, than the enactment of the “No Popery” laws, which made it penal for a Roman Catholic to keep a horse. The truth is, there was a manufacture in Dublin—and we remember it well; and we also, long before the union, recollect seeing crowds of starving operatives demanding charity from the wealthy, and constantly beseeching their sickly and baseless manufacture to be supported by appeals to charity balls, and by calling on Irishmen, in the name of patriotism, not to wear any thing of French or English fabric. Doubtless, then, we did possess manufactures, which now have passed away, when deprived of the absurd protection under which they dragged on their sickly and precarious existence.

But what also do we recollect? Why, that we had beef and mutton for 1½d. and 2d. per lb.; we bear in mind, that wool was but seven shillings per stone, and that it was not worth the farmer’s while to grow

corn or send it up to Dublin for sale, unless he was paid by Parliament so much per mile, as a bounty on its transmittance. Let us ask then the anti-unionist, who laments over our annihilated manufactures, how are they to be restored by means of this repeal. Dare the Dublin Parliament re-enact the protecting duties? If so, they must be met with corresponding prohibitions on the other side of the water; and England will gladly take the opportunity of resorting to Poland for her corn, and to Holland, Holstein, and the Ukrain, for her cattle, her beef, and her bacon; and then our farmers, while wearing their coats of national manufacture at double price, must look where they may for the means of paying for them, when they have no price at all for the produce of the soil. England at present manufactures for us, and in return takes our cattle and corn—the Yorkshire man is obliged to buy our wheat and eat our bacon and butter, which he could import at half the same price into the port of Hull from the Continent; the Lincolnshire feeder is obliged to seek at Ballinasloe for his store bullocks, and there pay £9. a-head for the same stock—and drive them across the half of Ireland and the whole of England—which in thirty hours he could land on his own shores from Walcheren, at one third the price.

The fact is, that England has been content to forego her system of free-trade for the sake of Ireland, and dares not follow up the great and acknowledged principle of commercial reciprocity, because thereby she would destroy the agricultural interest and landed proprietary of Ireland. If, therefore, Ireland accomplishes the repeal of the union, she necessarily deprives herself of any protecting duty from the commercial patronage of England. And if there be no protecting duty, we would ask, in what way would the dissolution of the legislative connection increase the manufacturing prosperity of the island? We would also ask, could the residence in Dublin for a portion of the year of five hundred members of parliament, compensate to this city for its present export trade in corn and cattle? Certainly not. Would their residence elevate or enrich any one, except a few shopkeepers?—and we are not quite sure that even they would be much advantaged. It is well known that tradesmen in general are not so much enriched by the consuming wealthy few, as by the consuming numbers of the middle, and the consuming many of the poorer classes;—and we are quite certain that the fashionables of both sexes would, in spite of all prohibition or patriotism, still resort to London or Paris, instead of laying out their money with either the Liberty weaver, or the Grafton-street shop-keeper.

Well, but if we had our own parliament, the members would have the interests of Ireland more at heart. We do not think so;—they might, as when we had our former precious parliament, have their own private interests and party jobs paramountly at heart, and put again in practice a system of speculation and fiscal robbery, such as no other country but Ireland ever witnessed. As long as the members of the Irish parliament are composed of the landed proprietors, they must look to their own properties; and, on Mr. O'Connell's own showing, this was lately very amply exhibited, when he brought forward his measure for the repeal of the subletting act—the Irish members, as they had been the original promoters of that law, so they voted against its repeal—and so well they might.

Well, but absenteeism would be removed by a repeal of the union. We think otherwise. Absenteeism was an evil—a loudly complained of evil—long before the union. In Richard the Second's time severe laws were enacted against it in vain; on sundry other occasions the mat-

ter was brought under the consideration of Parliament, and yet could not be obviated; and we are quite sure that, unless Mr. O'Connell intends to deprive absentees of their properties—and he is not, we believe, altogether prepared to hint at that yet—as long as there is a steamboat or a rail-road to bring London virtually nearer to Cork or Limerick than Dublin now is, the repeal of the union will not put a stop to absenteeism.

Another objection of Mr. O'Connell's against the union is, that our imports, taking into consideration the great growth of population, have not proportionately increased; and, therefore, poverty is extending in the land, and the union must consequently be an evil. But to this we would in the first place, generally reply, that this is putting the *non causa pro causa*; for, admitting the decreased importation, it remains to be proved that it has resulted from the union: and upon the particulars of the case we would, on the one hand, observe, that the increase of population has taken place principally amongst the potato-eaters, and not amongst the consumers of imported articles—and on the other, that the data upon which Mr. O'Connell goes are unsound; for it appears that before the union, many of these articles—for instance, tea and sugar—were imported directly into Ireland, paid duty here, and consequently appeared in the Irish returns to parliament, from whence Mr. O'Connell derived his information—while at present, as is well known to every person conversant on the subject, they are imported DUTY PAID from London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and Bristol, the great emporia of the East and West India trades, and therefore the amount does not make its appearance in the Irish revenue reports.

But what has become of the northern linen trade—was that destroyed by the union? Would it be revived by the repeal? Certainly not. Circumstances, with which the Union had no connection, caused its decline—and these circumstances would continue to produce their effects, in spite of the repeal. The manufacturers injured themselves, in the first instance, by their bad bleaching; then, at the peace, they were met in the market and undersold by the French and Flemish fine linens, and by the coarse Silesian fabrics; and, more than all, the wearing of very cheap cotton cloth has in a great degree superseded the use of linen. And it is a notorious fact, to be ascertained by any one who goes into the eastern districts of the province of Ulster, that in the places where linen was formerly manufactured, cotton-weaving is now working its way; and in a few years, there is every reason to believe, that if O'Connell and his clan would keep back their agitating curse from the land, Ulster would again exhibit a revival of prosperous manufacture, and with it—what it never had before, and which Arthur Young bitterly lamented the absence of—a very improved state of agriculture.

These are a few of the reasons which, in our humble opinion, would render it unprofitable on the part of Ireland, to dis sever herself from England. We hold it, that if, of two relatives or friends, the one was very rich and the other very poor, it would be worse than imprudent—it would be folly in the extreme—for the poorer to seek occasion to quarrel and part company with the richer, when there was every reason to induce the former to expect, that if he conducted himself quietly and in a friendly guise, he would receive of the other's substance, and be helped forward by his wealth. Just so, we think, the case stands with respect to Ireland. We deem that if, by her own seeking, she severs the union, she at the same time cuts the aqueduct, by means of which the Pactolus of England, her golden-sanded stream—her wealth, her

industry, her habits, and her institutions—may be spread in a thousand rivulets over our rough and unproductive land.

Having thus, as briefly as might be, in this short and very imperfect sketch, given our view of the question, as to its profit, we would, before entering on its practicability, consider what would be the inevitable tendency of this repeal of the union. Supposing the parliamentary connection to be dissevered, and the gentlemen of the national bank obliged to surrender their columned edifice to its original destination—what would follow? Either the Irish parliament would agree in all its politics and enactments with the British—and in that case there would be no need of a separation, and they might have still remained under the same roof, at St. Stephen's; or the Irish parliament would differ with that on the other side of the water—and here we should have division in the empire, a division such as that threatened in the reign of George the Third, on the regency question; and so the two parliaments would be committed with each other, which must bring on a separation, civil war, and a re-conquest of the island by Great Britain. Moreover, we are to bear in mind, that as Mr. O'Connell has ever and always identified with his plan of repeal, the indispensable measures of universal suffrage and vote by ballot—how, in that case, would the lower house here work with the aristocratic one in England—and who would be *our* legislators? Would the landed proprietors, who are principally Protestant? Would the Irish House of Commons be a representation of the property of the country? Certainly not. We are as convinced as we are of the reality of the pen we hold, that not ten members could be returned by the wealth and intelligence of the land. No; it would be composed of the creatures of a factious mob; and political churchmen would be the returning officers. Will any man venture to deny this? Will any man say, that if even the forty-shilling freeholders were restored, not to speak of universal suffrage—if the people voted by ballot, subject as they are to the constant control of the confessional, and with the fears of two worlds enlisted on the side of their church—that the parliament of Ireland would not be a priests' parliament. Yes, the late elections in Tipperary, Clare, and Waterford, attest the truth of what we say. And what would be the work of this convention of representatives of a bigoted mob constituency? Why the established order of things would scarcely exist a single session. And first, of course, the Church Establishment would be looked to—and not, we apprehend, for its correction or reform, but for a change of masters. It is easy for Dr. Doyle, or any other individual member of the Roman Catholic church, to say, as from himself, that HE would not wish HIS church should be re-established; but the Church of Rome cares not—she never did care—for the acts or sayings of any of her members. She allows them to talk and write—and if they can deceive, blindfold, and misdirect the world as to her ultimate views, so much the better; but she holds on her own way, unchanged and unchangable—*semper eadem* is the inscription on her high and holy banner; and as she has made it one of the commandments of the church, to pay tithes to the *lawful* pastors, so there is little doubt but she would, with all due speed, oblige a subservient parliament to announce her priests the only lawful pastors. Oh, but is there not the Protestant House of Lords to reject such a bill, and an English Protestant King, as a *dernier* resort, to put in his veto;—and are we to suppose that such obstacles would stop a mob House of Commons? No such thing. The upper house would be voted a nuisance, and an English king would be proclaimed an absurdity; and doubtless a new edi-

tion of Cornelius O'Mahony's book (which was written at the time the James's-town bishops desired to dethrone Charles the Second) would be published, and the old tenet would be revived, that it was better altogether to "cut the painter," and make a Milesian and Catholic king the sovereign over a Catholic and Milesian people. Now, we would simply ask, whether it would not be better to have the free exercise of our religious principles guaranteed to us as it is by the present order of things, than to have the Roman Catholic made the law church of the land?

The next step in this good work would be, a repeal of the act of settlement—the usurpations of Cromwell and William would be brought out; and why should a *short* possession of 170 or 140 years bar the prior and most ancient Milesian title?—and why should Protestants hold places of honour and emolument? they held them long enough—every dog has his day! This by many may be considered an overstrained, and therefore an absurd view of what would be the consequences of the repeal of the legislative connection. But, really, if such men are blind to historical inferences, and to the analogies drawn from the actions of men placed under the operations of the same motives, and under the influence of the same sanctions, we are not; and we must not consider history, as an old almanack out of date, or the lessons taught by the records of our ancestors, as not to be regarded.

We, therefore, cannot for a moment suppose that the Protestants of Ireland, of any persuasion are to be so duped by the sophisms and declamation of demagogues, as to be led to give their suffrage to the repeal;—Protestants, we say, of *any* denomination. We are quite sure that the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland cannot be so gulled. We are as certain as we are of our own individuality, that they would no more desire the severance of the empire, than would their dissenting brethren of Scotland, or Yorkshire, or Lancashire; they are quite as certain of religious and political liberty being secured to them, and watched over for them by an imperial parliament, composed of the talent, the energy, and the honesty of three kingdoms, as if subjected to the liberal policy and tender mercies of a mob-directed parliament in Ireland. It is very right and proper for O'Connell now to desire to conciliate the dissenters of Ireland, and to take hold of their conscientious, though quiescent, disrelish of a law-established church, in order to call in their aid to further his ulterior views; but he has mistaken his men. We know how, on former occasions he attempted to wheedle—and when he failed, he abused them. And we are quite sure, that the well-thinking dissenters of the North see through the flimsy tissue of the network that is set to haul them in; and they rest assured that the religious and civil liberties which they now enjoy, and which will be assured and confirmed by a closer union, and a greater identity of interest, arising from the international circulation of capital while connected with England and Scotland, would not be increased or benefited by dis severing them from the land of their forefathers, or from the people with whom they are connected by every social and religious tie.

Having thus endeavoured to show that the repeal of the union would not be profitable, we shall now consider whether it would be practicable—and even at the risk of penning a truism, must announce that there are but two ways in which the measure can be carried, by fair or by foul means—with the consent of all parties, or in despite of opposition. Mr. O'Connell, it would appear, as far as he has as yet gone, disclaims all appeals to force—if we understand him aright, he would act much in the same manner as he did when pressing the relief bill—he would pe-

tition—he would muster his forces in a *civil* way—he would agitate in clubs, aggregate meetings, associations, and Romish chapels—he would march men with green boughs in their hands, instead of pikes—he would parade his forces at all points and in all places—and would say thereby to the government, “See what we *can* do *if*, and what we *will* do, *when* we are angry !” His success on the occasion of the relief bill will embolden him to resume the same tactics—but did all this carry the relief bill? Did the swaggering of the demagogue—did the crusade of the priest—did the rising, as we may say, of the millions of Ireland, carry this great measure? No such thing, we assert—we would not, we *dare* not, disgrace the character of the Duke of Wellington and his ministry so much, as to assume that *he* was intimidated into it, by such a craven consideration. No; we maintain that it was not Romish but Protestant public opinion that caused theory and principle to triumph over the warnings of experience and the bodings of apprehension—it was for the purpose of putting the top and coping stone to the edifice of the constitution of England—it was the high, the brave, the fearless triumph of British toleration and Protestant liberality—we repeat it was the public opinion of the educated and enlightened Protestants of the British empire, that asserted the cause, and won the measure, and that it was not the effect of intimidation; and when carried, it was achieved, not because, but in spite of, Romish agitation; and therefore the present case bears no parallel with it. There is not one liberal and enlightened man among the Protestants of England, Scotland, or Ireland in favour of it—there is not a man of common sense in Parliament or out of it to give it his suffrage—it but stands forth to the patriots of the empire as a broad and palpable instance of the insolence of the Irish demagogue, and the ingratitude and insatiable unsatisfactoriness of those to whom relief was granted.

Mr. O’Connell, therefore, may, with Dr. Doyle at his back, agitate all Popish Ireland; and he may get such madmen as Tom Steele, and certain Dublin grocers, butchers, haberdashers, tailors, shoemakers—yea, all brogue-makers, calling themselves Protestants, to join him in his petition; but he will not get the great Protestant body to be so suicidal to their religion, their properties, their liberties, and, we would say, their lives, as to join him in his objects. Well, but suppose all his agitating clubs and associations are of no avail—suppose his petitions are scouted out of the house of commons—will ulterior measures succeed?—will the last appeal be successfully resorted to? We are assured not. Though perhaps the majority of the Protestants of Ireland are now grievously offended at the passing of the relief bill—though they are sore under the neglect with which they are treated, and probably inwardly rejoice that their forbodings are verified, when they see the country not one whit the quieter, or the disturbers of public tranquillity not one particle the more contented than they were before, and who seem to have made the acquisition of the last great position but a platform on which they can erect a battery to beat in a breach on the integrity of the British empire—while the Protestant sees all this, and perhaps rejoices with a joy unbefitting, and yet almost pardonable—still we hold that, were the O’Connell demagogues and priests to raise the people to seek the repeal of the union at the point of the pike, the men of Derry, of Enniskillen, and of Ballibay, would be found in the right ranks; and the Protestants of Ireland, churchman and dissenter, making common cause to evince that not only the property, and the worth, and the intelligence and moral power, but even the *applicable* physical force

of the land was on the side of the connexion with England. It is, therefore, quite idle for O'Connell's understrappers to desire the Irish people "to look to the French, who had the courage, amid the thunder of cannon, to drag the Bourbon from his throne." It is futile for their orator to urge Romanists to "cheer up, and catch a halo from the tomb of Sarsfield," and never to forget the glories of Limerick, Galway, or Athlone. For the same Protestants, when provoked, can again route a Sarsfield from a field like Aughrim—hunt an O'Connell, with all his yellow dragoons, from Enniskillen, and can storm Athlone—capture Galway, and besiege Limerick. And let then these gentry have done with their military blusterings—let a Scully boast of the natural strength of Ireland—of the number of her military positions—of her capabilities for warfare by land and sea—let such bear in mind, that the Protestants in Ireland, in union with their brothers of England and Scotland, are in the middle of these passes, and are possessed of these points and positions—let them also recollect, that Great Britain, by the means of her steam power, can now land, in forty-eight hours, 100,000 men on any part, east, west, north, or south, of the island; that it is not now, as it was in Cromwell's time, when it took three months to transport a small army; but that now, and in future, it will be easier to transport a large army from London or Yorkshire, to any port in Ireland, than to convey the same number of men from Limerick or Galway, to Dublin. We hold it, then, to be utterly impracticable, either by fair or foul means, to carry the measure against the will of the Government, and people of Great Britain.

But there is another point of view, in which we would look at the contemplated measure, and that is, why it is, that England herself should be inimical to it? And we deliberately hold it, that, except on the grounds of political safety, and under the apprehension of a foreign war, that her western flank would thereby be exposed; for in this point of view, her Irish connexion is certainly a matter of consequence—no advantage from it has resulted to England. For what has England ever gained by Ireland—how much of her burden has she borne, and how much has the retention of Ireland cost her? We allow, that the day may come when it will be otherwise—when the resources of Ireland are developed—when British capital, in days of peace and security, is employed in calling forth the capabilities of the country, then Ireland may be the strength, and not the weak, sore, vulnerable part of the empire. But we are free to assert, that as long as the political priests and demagogues of Ireland continue to cast the rod of bitterness into all the streams of the land, as long as national distinctions, and hatreds, are maintained and cherished; and until education, untrammelled by priestcraft, has done its work in liberalising, and expounding, and unbigotting the minds of the people of Ireland, we can foresee little peace, or happiness, or affluence for the country. Still we would desire to hope, (as we stated in our last publication,) that this detestable subject of agitation is only the creature of one man's imagining; and that, as it has arisen in his mind from the soreness and outraged self-esteem, caused by not finding that admiration and acceptance in a British House of Commons, which, in the day of his demagogue power, he experienced, when he was cock of his own walk: so we may hope, that when this individual comes to his better senses, he will turn his active and energetic mind to some other measures more feasible, and more likely to benefit his country—the introduction of a modified system of poor laws, cautiously adapted in their use, and protected from abuse; such a tax

on absentees as would oblige them to contribute their fair proportion to the exigencies of the state, and the necessities of the poor ; a general commutation of tithes, and a regulation of church rates ; some liberal and feasible plan for the employment of the poor ; some well-regulated system of cottage tenure and cottage industry ; some well-understood enactment, whereby elections would be simplified, and brought to the door of every freeholder ; some restrictions on the interference of the clergy of all persuasions on political matters ; some arrangement, whereby a large and able committee of both houses of parliament should, prior to the assembling of parliament, sit in Dublin, to consult upon Irish affairs, and propose wise and matured measures for its better government ; some plan that might induce the nobility to reside for a portion of the year on their estates, now that many of them are tired with France and Italy, and even England. If Mr. O'Connell would endeavour to advocate—if he were found the active and untried solicitor of Ireland's interests, at the bar of the British senate, advancing her agriculture, her trade, her fisheries, and her manufactures—then, indeed, he would in his descending years, carry with him as he walked towards the grave, the united suffrages of all sects and parties, and it might be inscribed on his tomb, here lies the benefactor, the blessing, and the friend of Ireland and the empire. As a conclusion to this, our humble view of the state and bearings of this great question, which is now so unhappily mooted, we give in the way of appendix, a sort of tabular and comparative view of the state of Scotland and Ireland, from the commencement of the sixteenth century, to their respective legislative union with England, and also a sketch of their respective prosperities, with regard to exports and imports.

PROGRESSIVE PROSPERITY OF IRELAND.

In 1611 the Exports and Imports of Ireland united were valued at only £211,000.

	Exports.	Imports.
In 1814.....	£ 6,590,249.....	£6,687,732.
1820.....	7,179,223.....	5,187,014.
1823.....	8,152,750.....	6,020,975.

The revenue of Ireland in 1824 was £5,201,714., not equal to that of Scotland, with less than a third of her population.

Proofs of Scottish prosperity, with a population of two millions, a generally severe climate, and five million acres of arable land.

Amount of territorial productions, including mines and fisheries..... £26,158,608.
Annual value of manufactures..... 14,189,486.

In 1656 the shipping of Scotland carried	5,736 tons,
1760.....	53,913 —
1800.....	171,728 —
1828.....	300,536 —

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1755.....	£ 465,411.....	£535,576.
1801.....	2,579,914.....	2,844,502.
1825.....	4,944,304.....	5,842,269.

In 1707 (the first year of the union) the revenue was £110,694.
1813 4,843,229.

Population, since the union, doubled.

Comparative View of the state of Scotland and Ireland, from the commencement of 16th century to their respective Legislative unions with England.

16th Century. Scotland an independent kingdom. Distracted with religious feuds. Civil war during Mary's reign.	16th Century. Ireland, a dependency of England. Distracted with religious feuds. Rebellion of O'Neill and Desmond.
17th Century. English authority confirmed in Scotland by the union of the two crowns. The religion of the majority different from that of England. Reign of James I. tranquil. Civil wars in the reign of Charles I. Efforts to maintain Presbyterianism successful.	17th Century. English authority confirmed in Ireland by the plantations in Ulster and Connaught. The religion of the majority different from that of England. Reign of James I. tranquil. Civil wars in reign of Charles I. Efforts to restore Popery unsuccessful.
Civil and religious feuds in the reign of Charles II. Prevalence of Jacobitism in the reign of William III.	Ireland comparatively tranquil under Charles II. Civil war which ended in the overthrow of James II.
18th Century. Legislative union with England in the reign of Anne.	18th Century. Commencement of penal laws against Roman Catholics in Anne's reign.
Equally poor and uneducated.	

Comparative View of the two countries from the union with Scotland to the union with Ireland.

Scotland greatly agitated — Union extremely unpopular during the reigns of George I. and II.—Rebellions of 1715 and 1745, under princes of the house of Stuart, and many of the Scottish nobility, and consequently little improvement in agriculture, commerce, or manufactures.	Ireland enjoys a forced tranquillity in the reigns of George I. and II. partly the result of her sufferings during two centuries of civil war, and partly the result of the penal laws.
First rise of Scotland's prosperity in the reign of George III. The union had rendered it, in every sense, an integral portion of the British empire, and when tranquillity was completely restored, and its loyalty secured, the English government, particularly under the administration of the great earl of Chatham, gave every encouragement to its commerce and manufactures. It has since become next to England, the most commercial nation in Europe, and, with respect to education, good order, and tranquillity, the first.	Little advancement in commerce or the useful arts. The first dawn of Irish prosperity in the reign of George III. Most oppressive penal laws removed in 1778. Independence of Irish parliament and free trade granted in 1782. Further abrogation of penal laws in 1793. Good results expected from these measures frustrated by the democratico religious rebellion of 1798, which led to the legislative union of 1801.

Comparative State of Ireland and Scotland since commencement of 18th century.

Scotland tranquil and prosperous, as proved by the increase of her commerce, agriculture, manufactures, and revenue.	Ireland agitated, yet slowly advancing in commercial prosperity, notwithstanding the party feuds occasioned by Ribbonmen, Orangeism, Catholic Associations, Brunswick Clubs, &c. Catholic emancipation granted by the last parliament of George IV. yet in the reign of William IV. agitation has commenced, by efforts for a repeal of the union.
--	---